

UDC 159

*Valentin-Bădescu
Romania*

ETHICAL AND MORAL BEHAVIOR, THE DETERMINING FACTOR OF SOCIAL AND SPIRITUAL REVIVAL IN ROMANIA

Introductory Matters relating to responsibility as a social institution.

The issue is far too broad, but that organizers of the editorial constraints imposed a highly concise approach to networking concepts set out in the title. Therefore, we will review the concepts, which have been and are themselves the subject of extensive debate, but from the perspective of accountability in today's world, a world where you can't sleep peacefully, with individuals taking place and its activities willingly or unwillingly in smaller communities or more extensive, it interferes with the other members of the social group to which they belong, and affect them or during the latter.

The philosophical point of view, responsibility means solidarity with those individuals or acts of others, whose consequences would seem desirable for oneself and for the Organization of, and carrying out times to decide which adheres freely. Seen in relation to the freedom, responsibility can be defined as a dialectic correlation between individual freedom and collective; when the individual, acting freely, not only affects, but also stimulates the shape and reinforce the freedom of other individuals of the group or the community.

The responsibility is not only an individual and collective responsibility, dedication and their adherence to a particular question (ideal), but also a way for their reporting on the case, assuming some liabilities and risks, acting sometimes beyond systems of rules that govern the rights and obligations, in order to attain adhere.

Responsibility differs in this respect. If the responsibility for human behavior within a system of rules dictated by the company, or if it violates these rules, if not acting in accordance with these, refer to autoangajarea-provided, sprung from the system of norms became a liability that requires individual (or organization) by autoconstrângere. The relationship between responsibility and guilt does so not only legal implications but primarily moral criterion for assessing human behavior in this case inside and out, based on the immanent value-judgments'.

In other words, the attitude of the person to assume the consequences of its activities towards other individuals is known in sociology as the liability. In the literature, this notion was never given and other definitions of you point out the following:

- Responsibility means accepting and bearing the consequences of the individual's moral, social, legal, financial, disciplinary and material of the designed and made of it.

- Responsibility means caring for the success or outcome of the risk, and effectiveness of, the consequences of the activity it carries agent or a lead for the benefit of the community and who is affected by the outcome of this action.

- Responsibility means the option and engaging the individual in the process of socialization for the execution of an action, the facts or to have a certain social behavior in order to achieve a particular purpose, relating to the activities undertaken and of the other individuals in education.

The analysis of the definitions of accountability are set to be a few characteristics that relate mainly to the fact that it is specific to each individual who works in the process of socialization that is optional, and it is a result of the commitment of each individual as a social institution of the value chain, and in appreciation of her the individual's intentions and the consequences of the action taken for the purpose of persons responsible for actions to improve the system.

Responsibility is always tied to good behavior (moral, political, legal) and it assumed responsibility from the individuals that prevents this behavior. Unlike of liability, liability has the following features:

-is a normative and social institution.

-it is mainly normative and value as it is not the responsibility of the individual considers the values of conduct accepted by them freely;

-the individual is required by the company;

-aimed at preserving social system;

-is assigned to each individual is assessed according to concrete actions;

-it only intervenes when it violated a norm of reaction.

The rules of conduct were violated, individuals knows many forms such as: moral responsibility, political and legal. All these forms of liability are in fact forms of social control over individuals with deviant behavior.

The ethics value concept. The most easy and often answer the question "what is meant by ethical values?" is the one who give subjectivist concepts: 1 the value of ethics means individual preference, and the criterion of preference is pleasure. Value, for me, what I like now thousand, in the situation where I am. Things in themselves are devoid of any value; they exist as such, pure and simple. The value we get from the topic that needs and enjoying them. In this vision value judgment "X is good" is tantamount to the judgment of taste "I like X". As a result, each individual has his or her personal values, which leads to a total relativism.

Under the motto of multiculturalism, dynamic and diverse world in which we live encourages this kind of subjectivist values understanding, brokered by each individual in terms of his pleasures. No one questions the role and

importance of individual preferences into a society that provides a plurality of dizzying choices on all levels: Professional, consumer, leisure, entertainment, etc., in front of a superabundant of goods, services and occupations; judgment of taste and personal preferences play an extremely important role. And yet, neither the values on the part of individual preference, nor the idea that each ins has its own system of values, is a contradiction in terms.

There are individual preferences are unacceptable from the point of view of others, whereas the pleasure of one causing damage, suffering or discomfort of others. Even the most rudimentary common sense judgment must support an amendment which undermines the essential subjectivity axiology: decisive values have a supraindividual, and may not be validated as being "value" than those of individual preferences that can meet the social agreement, whereas the good pleasure of the individual non-evil and suffering of others.

The distinction between preference and value can be found just as easily and if we decide not to do the other. In each of us there are disagreements or conflicts, sometimes painful, between what we prefer to do and what, in full sincerity, cherish; between what we like and what we know or judge it would worth to the plate. Certainly coward who prefer to give tribute to the in the face of real or imaginary risks, comply with, in his mercy, courage and would like to be brave even if you can. Often, those little place he loathes arts their neighbors with a physically attractive, but because they cherish the beauty of that value, but on the contrary, precisely because of the lack of this piqued resentment attribute so important in life. Lines are tasting with relish the pleasure of cutting the leaf to the dogs and making the Earth's shadow in vain, but would never dare to believe in and of itself that's laziness is a "value", for he knows all too well what respect is worth the hard work, perseverance and the seriousness of those who toil from dawn until late at night. The pleasure is not only stupid but also a counselor and a tyrannical master that enslaves to schizoid mind. Can be shared like smokers, drunks, drug addicts and sexual pervert who believe, in their minds, that the pleasures, without which I cannot live, are very good. Unfortunately for them, a good many of these slaves of vices, which can no longer escape, are aware of their moral degradation or urges others to take the same road. Fortunately for society, too few people are willing to give them credence.

Ethical values are important and worthy of respect not only for the ins, but aspire to recognition by supraindividual. Our preferences, we differ from others, while values bring us together in a spiritual community. And what makes us do we experience and to cherish values is not, first and foremost, whimsical and fleeting pleasure, but a rational judgment, only faculty able to conceive what is sustainable in general and the human condition.

The conceptual Boundaries of ethics norm. Typically, when we consider the ethics rule we think of examples of ethical rules such as "thou shalt not lie", "thou shalt not steal!", "help your neighbor!," "Meet the parents" and "Meet your always promises!" Indeed, it hardly seems very simple to a lot of ethical rules. Here, the norm very often seen as the typical ethical and particularly relevant in the field of business: "thou shalt not steal!" Theft of any kind is an inglorious deed and deeply immoral.

But if we think, we note that the prohibition "thou shalt not steal!" is one of the ten commandments of the Old Testament, and, as such, and a religious norm. On the other hand, stealing is not only an act immoral, but also illegal, as it defies a legal norm. The vast majority of the ethical rules are today, at the same time, and religious or legal rules. For this reason, it is very hard to put together a list of rules, only to meet them than in the ethic, as there are very few situations in which, by making it, the individual to be and act ethically, only without any implication of a vital commercial, economic, social, political or religious. Instead of looking for the typical ethical norms and not found elsewhere than in the sphere of "pure", must, rather, let's see what specific attributes a regulatory sign in the field of ethics. To this end we need some clarifications regarding the overall conceptual potency.

A norm is a model for action, which should be applied in certain circumstances. Each time presenting a behavioral pattern abstract, ideal for a gender specific action that leave aside aspects of incidental and insignificant in the context of a social right next to important things to be done or avoided. Even if it is correct, the above characterization needs some clarification before we formulate a definition acceptable to the rules in the first place, even if the application of longstanding rules leads to the formation of habits, a normative model must be assumed by the individual consciously. For this reason, automated reflexes, stereotyping and any type of good or bad habit-which were acquired unwillingly and unnoticed by the topic does not belong to the domain specified.

Secondly, a norm is a pattern of behavior, which has a meaning and a valid supraindividual. Finally, the individual can be consciously conforming to the rules only if it is explicitly stated as a supraindividual model behavior. Simple statistical patterns of social uniformity, spontaneously through imitation or „social training” have nothing in common with the normative action.

A rule is a rule of behavior, validity supraindividual, explicitly stated in the collective consciousness as a standard of conduct, deliberately accepted and respected by individuals. It would be meaningless if it would require an impossible behavior. At the same time, a rule would be absurd and unreasonable if they request a behavior required that all men would be spontaneous. Any time an individual's address, which you can do certain things without having to make

them. Therefore, a reasonable time is meant to determine the individual free to conform to a particular pattern of action, whereas this model is socially desirable but not always followed spontaneously by all individuals. Thus, human freedom is the ontological Foundation of normatively. The freedom of the will is a complicated issue, which always has tormented our minds. But we should not be expecting solution of this twisting interrogation metaphysical, that explains the "How is the possible existence of freedom in the universe". We all have direct experience of our wills, whenever we have the real possibility to choose one of the more practical alternatives. Sometimes, the consequences of our choices are socially unimportant or indifferent. It's not anyone's business if I decide to spend their holidays at sea or in the mountains, in the country or abroad. No one should care if I choose to take in addition to home a cat or a dog and depends only on me if I drink the morning coffee, tea or milk.

In many other situations, however, our decision-making options have serious track others, so these options are no longer as socially, unimportant and indifferent. Specialists of the branch have shown experimentally that the people there are a strong inclination to comply with the opinion of the majority and behavioral patterns. Any time-like pattern of behavior-an acceptance and a conscious assumption on the part of the individual.

Speech intelligibility of the norm requires a process of social communication and the language forms its content. Therefore, the first constituent part of the rules, without which they might not be understandable and communicable, is the standard expression.

Normative expressions is characterized by two components, the content of the norm we understand behavioral model that you propose and request norm and their normative content, expressions give certain specifications very important rule.

By their nature, normative expressions can refer to:

-obligations, requiring the individual to do a certain thing, to be active for a certain attitude;

-ban or prohibition, asking the individual's imperative to refrain from committing certain acts or manifestations of certain attitudes;

-permissions, which allow the individual to adopt certain behaviors depending on its interests and preferences. In a sense, the standard permission is tantamount to the right of the individual, guaranteed by an authority to do or not do certain things.

No matter how important normative expression is not sufficient to cover all the dimensions of the actual rules of social behavior. Regulatory authority means a "power" or "Court" issuing a rule, having the ability to impose respect for individuals — whether by persuasion or by recourse to force. The authority may be denominated, where it is known and used, "out of sight" (Church,

Parliament, Government, Prefecture, etc.) or anonymous, when the norm is imposed by an "invisible", but as active, whether it's diffuse, but pressure of negligible, community, as happens when manners and customs whether we are dealing with certain vital requirements or spiritual, which require people to take a certain conduct in order to adapt them to the laws of nature and of society.

The norm is that class of individuals to whom it is addressed to the regulatory authorities, asking them or forcing them to follow a certain pattern of behavior. In some cases, the rule is explicitly or tacitly, clear regulatory authority when aimed at a category of individuals, at other times, the rule is not specified when the rule is breached by anyone, without exception.

The field of application of the standard means first-class practical situations or contexts in which regulatory authority requires the subject to take a certain pattern of behavior. Any effective regulation is sustained and strengthened by certain sanctions of favorable or unfavorable consequences: for the subject of standardized, arising in accordance with the provisions of the regulatory authority and warnings from the implementation/violation of the rule action. Application of rule premier sanctions rewards, while the punitive damages punish violations of them. Some penalties are physical or material rewards and prizes in money or goods, exemption from taxes, gratuities, or, on the contrary, damages, fines, deprivation of liberty, the suspension of certain rights etc.; others are of a psychic or spiritual praise, thanks, admiration, respect, or, on the contrary, blame, shame, contempt, stigmatization or ostracism.

The strength of a society of manners is given by fires', enforced by the continuity of the tradition. The inertia of a society is more and more accentuated her conservative traditionalism, with both increases in people's consciousness that the illusion of eternal habits is part of the same order of the world. "This is the new" seems to be finding it there remaining unimplemented like, which takes note of the existence of a certain way of life given once and for all, as well as climate or landscape specific. It is important to note that customs preserved by tradition is not based on rational arguments and are not bound by a deliberate decision; they are as they were always and only because they are, must be respected. For this reason, the Customs shall not by force but by belief, conformism, prompted by pressure from the herding community that defends the spiritual identity of the individual. It must obey them whether by, as it wants to be accepted by others and not to be marginalized or excluded from their ranks.

Observing the traditions of different peoples or local communities inevitably a total relativism, according to which any particular ethos, there is no better or worse than any other. At this level do not ethnographic argue, because each community on the basis of its historical traditions, whose inertia tends to keep it as unspoiled habits and customs. Through their various societies mores

and historical eras are different from each other, and keeping the traditions just to assert and protect identity.

Through their various societies mores and historical eras are different from each other, and keeping the traditions just to assert and protect the spiritual identity, and its own way of life. Between the mores and customs of a society, on the one hand, and ethical, there are important differences.

First, ethics is based on the individual's freedom to decide on its mode of life, while traditional customs are imposed on individual data and as models made in actual history. I saw that in a minimal definition, freedom is the ability of the individual to opt in to a set of practical alternatives, to do what he thinks fit in a situation in which if open more trails is supposed possible, uneven in terms of value and meaning that it confers on the agent.

Secondly, unlike habits, they argue only the prestige and authority of tradition, even if they are sometimes incomprehensible, ethical rules to contend with rational arguments. If the question: "why do people in mourning need to dress in black?" cannot be answered except as noted "so it is appropriate to us," any questions like "why it's good to tell the truth?", "why do you have to steal it?", "what a man needs to abide by its promises?" can be answered with different arguments-that's right, questionable and disputable, but comprehensible. (For example: If all people would tell the truth only when it suits them and would lie whenever they have something at stake, then no one would no longer be credible, and the harmonization of social relations would be impossible.)

Finally, the customs, and mores are always special, specific cultural and climate of a particular historical period, marking the individuality of human communities, the ethical rules have a pretense of universality, and some of them (such as, for example, the prohibition of sexual relations incest, theft, crime or deceit) are universally valid. The claim of universality can be often no intermediate; slavery, the inferiority of women compared with men, the right of parents to provide their children the discretionary and other social relationships of this genus has long been regarded as the moral, but the historic progress has invalidated subsequently. But this claim there is any rule of moral behavior they assert universal validity.

Ethical Rules and "commandments" religious. Many people more or less religious, they are convinced that, without faith, ethics crumble or alter. Monotheistic religions or dependable, universal ethical standards support as high as possible and, over the centuries, the ethical beliefs of the immense majority of the people have been cured of their religious faith.

A series of facts, easily observable in the contemporary world, contradict this postulate of one-sided dependence and the need of the ethics of religious belief. Unmistakable there are people who believe in God, some of them even

with fervor, which does not prevent them from "sin", cabstand by what they think, say and do "the commandments". On the other hand, there are people who don't believe in God, whether they are atheists or agnostics, and proving a high ethical probity.

Between the core of every religion and dogmatic code of ethics it claims there is a relative independence. On the one hand, it is found that, in spite of differences, dogmatic Christianity, Judaism, Islam or Buddhism promotes the same fundamental ethical rules. It's not too risky proposition that ethics is the land on which the different denominations meet and are compatible. On the other hand, not only is that religious faith influences and shapes the work ethic; in its turn, ethos a cultural community puts its mark on his religious experience, resulting in the consecration of different ethical overtones. For example, both Christian ethics, and despise, blame and Muslim be prohibited comate, Jewish ethics. This is one of the reasons why, in the middle ages, currency and securities became the monopoly of the Jews, barred from practicing other occupations monopolized by Christians or Muslims. As with the dawn of capitalism, money has become the "blood" of the society, the Community Bankers Jews has become a force to reckoned with, likely to intensify resentment of other confessions.

Even within the same religion, different denominations are separated by the dogmatic distinctions based on ethical attitudes. For instance, orthodoxy has withheld from the myth of original sin that, after his expulsion from Paradise, Adam received as divine sanction taking care of tomorrow and the obligation to work; divine punishment, labor, and toil to do what

Between the "commandments" religious and moral norms there are differences:

-First, the authority of religious commandments is outside the individual's "strength" or the Court who requires a specific behavior is divine, whose greatness incomprehensible rationale, which defy it offers no explanation, no argument. The only freedom that is given to man is to obey commands or not. The ethical rules is the conscience of the individual inner will of autonomous, subject to its own deliberations and rational assessments of the value of its decisions and the consequences arising there from. One is not to steal because God, in whose "eyes" invisible you follow always and everywhere, to punish you for cutest to not submit to his will; something else is not to steal because their own conscience judge theft as a deed unworthy, and your will is subject to rational judgment, often in spite of inclinations, desires, appetites, or momentary interests;

-Secondly, the subject of religious commandment is faithful, faithful follower of a particular religion. Israeli is permitted by the Torah There, and the Talmud to give money to usury, but not to eat pork. The Christian is allowed to taste the "blood of the Lord" and eat pork, but not allowed to borrow money with

interest. As well as Islam and Allah, but tells him that the pig is an animal defiled. Catholics are not allowed to divorce, and condemn abortion as infanticide Papacy, when the Protestants were allowed to divorce and to practice contraception, and the Church of England even allow gay marriage and include in its priests and congregations of gay bishops.

Their universality, the alleged ethical standards relate to man in general, whereas he deserves dignity and fulfillment of his being. Ethical standpoints, not drinking alcohol or certain foods are itself blamable, but the excess of food or drink, and any form of enslavement to Ego by greed. Ethically, the divorce is in itself a failure of partners and any decision taken easily parting is blamable; but if keeping a marriage has consequences punishment for one of the spouses or both, as well as for children or their close relatives, then divorce is a solution that is appropriate. With regard to abortion or homosexuality, opinions are divided, but every position trying to support with more or less rational a universal norm, be it of the prohibition of such practices, or the recommendation of tolerance toward them.

-the penalties will occur, the religious vision of the believers, especially in the afterlife; of course, God sends his reward or punishment in the world here, but what counts in the last instance is the heaven of the loved and forgiven by God or Hell, eternal fire which will consume the infidels, apostates and sinners. In contrast, rewards and punishments are entirely earthly world, whether coming from others, whether they are managed by the inner voice of your own consciousness.

Given, on the one hand, exclusivist each of the dominant religions in the modern world, and that the human experience is not any way to arbitrate disputes between religions, determining which one is the true, anchoring in religious faith ethics inevitably lead to relativism. At the same time, requires a difficult alternative: believers are deviation in the faith and to adopt the "boundary conditions" imposed by the moral empowerment and socialize more of contemporary society or bigoted, fanatic fundamentalism and anachronistic, increasingly more incompatible with the ethical horizon of the civilized world and in the course of globalization. He argues today bans, a tailored attire centuries ago, inequality between men and women, the absolute obedience of children toward parents, stealing and stoning women, cutting the hand of him who steals, prohibition of abortion and contraception, divorce and homosexuality, the ban on access to any cultural or media message or exclusivist certain professions and occupations, etc. are serious handicaps for integration of faith in modern society, which is becoming more and more believers tend to "negotiate" with the divinity which I think what and how much they are willing to abide by the ancient admire canons and rules of confession.

Ethical Standards and legal requirements. "Thou shalt not steal!" is not only a norm of ethics or a "commandment" of religion, but also a regulatory or legal limitation. Even if it is not afraid of divine punishment and even if it has no qualms of conscience, the thief must be afraid of "the long arm and relentlessly" of the law.

The authority imposing the legal prescription is, God, but, in contrast, belongs to the earthly world, always a political institution, juridical or administrative: Parliament, Government, Presidency, Prefecture, city, etc. Prescriptions imposed by the Executive power are required, and if necessary by force, by the police, prosecution, courts, courts of appeal, etc. On the contrary, the norm is being observed as the autonomous individual is himself convinced of his own reason and the will, of the validity of her world. The one who not only steals for fear do not bear the rigors of the law can always be tempted to acquire the assets of another whenever you feel protected from the consequences of his acts, whether it is the certainty that it will never be discovered or that rely on certain immunities, possibly in a corrupt and inefficient judicial system. When a person truly ethic will not steal again, regardless of whether or not exposed to the danger of incurring the law following his deed.

Subject to legal prescriptions always circumscribed within the limits of the "subject" of certain institutional authority. As a citizen of Romania have the legal obligation to pay the duties and taxes you owe the Romanian State and, according to our road code, are obliged to take the car on the right side; When traveling in England are, however, obliged to respect British laws, to pay the customs of the English for certain products introduced in their country and, if you want to arrive safely at your destination, you have to take on the left, no matter how unnatural and uncomfortable to me it would seem. Instead, the subject is always ethical standard credits: no one has the right and it's not nice to steal, no matter if it is a national English, British or Pakistani and whatever the legal provisions concerning the theft of every country. The sharpest difference between legal and ethical sanctions. As a rule, does not provide for sanctions, but only première punitive damages.

Respect is not rewarded, since it represents an obligation; at most one could say that enforcement entails an indirect reward, whereas gives the citizen the right to properly benefit from State protection in the exercise of freedoms. No one expects a reward from the authorities for failing to steal, not to lie, not to encroach or not to kill anyone. Instead, the sphere of law abounds for those punishments that violate the law. These punitive sanctions are, most often, physical or material damages, fines, confiscation, deprivation of liberty, the suspension of certain rights etc. Repentance or remorse only counts in little or even place. no one may be absolved of legal punishment due because, after he stole, he seems sincerely; on the other hand, having executed the penalty, a hot

resume life in freedom, as if nothing had happened, even though in and of itself did not regret one little fact to be stolen, but unlucky to be caught and convicted. On the one hand, ethical behavior entails, alike, penalties-such as première praise, respect, admiration and gratitude to others — or punitive-blame, scorn, contempt or repugnance of those around. Beyond all these rewards and punishments that come from the outside, the most powerful and specific ethical sanctions are those that come from each individual's consciousness inside us. They are psychic or spiritual nature; the wrong side of his own conscience be punished alone through regret, repentance, remorse, or shame, in which, in a strong work ethic, will be born a desire and determination never to repeat the same mistakes and, if you can, to straighten the river made possible and or others.

Normative expressions we form is useful when you want to distinguish between ethical rules of legal prescriptions. Most of the times, a legal prohibition is matched by a ban, but not vice versa. "You don't steal!", "You shall not kill!", "you lie!", etc., are both legal and moral prohibitions. "Don't be greedy!", "no symbol" are ethical prohibition that does not have a legal equivalent. But the most characteristic distinction lay in the fact that, where the law gives only a ban, adding a duty ethics or an obligation that cannot be imposed by outside law enforcement authority, but only the inner consciousness of each individual. Ethics demands, as well as the law, not to steal, not to lie, not to kill, etc.

But ethics only asks to be generous, unselfish and even magnanimous. It's not enough to take the property of another; a man with a strong ethical conscience accepts that it is his duty to the overflow or given to those who need and deserve a great amount of material. It's not enough to not lie; an ins ethical feels obliged to tell the truth, even if it assumes certain risks. It's not enough to not kill; Ethics asks you to do everything you do. the power to save a life in danger. No one can be called in front of the judge because he wanted to give the neighbor or brother or an amount of money that it might need to treat their sick time as wife to send their child to school. No one shall be condemned to the silent when being asked, has not revealed an injustice or a blackness that was unaware. From the point of view of ethics, however, these behaviors without selflessness are more or less blamable. We come to understand that legal rules, prohibiting acts of antisocial as well as stealing, lying, cheating, murder, tax-dodging to ensure a modicum of sociability, without which society would turn into a jungle, and the ethical rules, requiring an altruistic behavior, seek to establish a maximum of sociality, so as to facilitate the development of society and improve the human condition.

The distinction between ethical standards and legal regulations is of utmost importance in the business world. Many people consider that the sole obligation of an honest businessman is to abide by the laws in force; the

corollary being that managerial decisions aimed at maximizing profits within the limits of the law is not only legitimate, but even mandatory in terms of ethics. This is not so, for several reasons. In the first place, the very decision to abide by the law of nature. No matter how good on paper, laws become ineffective in a social climate in which the ethos encourages dishonesty and cultivate or corruption.

Legal provisions as such are subject to judicial. Some prescriptions are downright unethical. Unfortunately, today there are a number of ambiguous or wrong laws drawn up with effects as least legitimate in terms of ethics. On the other hand, in some cases, the law may be more prevalent than ethos at a time in a particular society. There are countries which have legislated artificial insignnia, organ transplantation, organ donation, gay marriage, consumption of certain drugs or euthanasia, but the majority of people reject these new freedoms of ethical considerations. Essential is the fact that in a democratic society, respect for the law is a seminal ethical value. A bad law or anachronism is changed through constitutional methods, but until you change it, it should be kept as it is, because the force of the law is more important than any possible inconvenience passage of a law or another. Finally, laws cannot nor should not regulate absolutely everything, inconstant and social activity in some overly rigid patterns. The most dynamic companies and performances are based on laws, short and clear, applied with the utmost probity and transparency. An inflation of bushy, laws in ever-changing, often contradictory and downright inapplicable or applied in a discriminatory manner engenders, of necessity, inefficiency and corruption. The existing legal framework, a businessman who is always open to several decisions, not all equally reliable or beneficial from the point of view of ethics. The restriction of liability of business ethics to respect for the law is not justified and not operational in practice. There are innumerable circumstances and unpredictable, that legal framework does not offer a concrete solution or, most often, offers a space of decision alternatives; the developer must evaluate them legally and ethically.

Conclusion. Specifics of ethical values. Ethical values always refer to the effects or consequences of our acts of others, or our own people. They define the traits of character whose cultivation and practical affirmation are likely to keep myself in check and our aggressive, antisocial, preventing us to produce unnecessary and unmerited suffering disadvantages. They stimulate our attitudes of solidarity with others so that our acts leading to the full affirmation of humanity from ourselves and from our peers.

The maximum benefit is related to the fulfillment of the human condition, both in his own existence of each individual, as well as in others, to the extent that they are affected and influenced by our acts and decisions. The opposite of good, evil is found in all our works which prevents us, so on each of us, and on

the other, to achieve the full humanity, causing pain and suffering punishment. The Abstract itself, the good can be achieved only by tracking in everything we do the underlying ethical values, such as honesty, courage, truth, justice, generosity, solidarity, etc. We cannot simply be good as we are, or fatty Brunei, but we get better as we grow into new ethical values in all societies and historical periods.

Extremely old ethical values weren't what they are today. In archaic times, the values were tied to the tradition, reinforced by religious faith. Centuries of isolation, due to the geographical and cultural, ethical values have had a local, private, meaning the cherished only by the members of a small community cultural and social classes. "Alien" was not recognized as a full human being, with the same rights, needs and aspirations, and is regarded with fear and hostility. The main mobile cultivation ethical values were not in those times distant respect for their intrinsic significance, but the desire to appeal to divinity and, especially, fear of divine punishment. Just when the world began to broaden, up by intensifying its contacts-between worlds and cultures as well as the traditional religions began to weaken, mankind began to put the question on the need to respect certain ethical values universally valid through their intrinsic significance, and not due to the imposition by the divine will. From this point we can speak of ethical values, in their full authenticity, since they are assumed as guidelines of our facts against any human being, since we're all equally people and independent of religious faith or unbelief. A good part of the ethical values have been, throughout history, reinforced by the force of the law, but that law does not impose a legal obligation, it remains as an ethical duty for those of us who firmly believe in the ethical values.

In the contemporary world, becoming more integrated through the process of globalization, the ethical values tend to exercise more and more the role of Coordinator and hierarchical. The trend is weak, due to competition with other dominant values. After so long as the religion has been the Coordinator of the entire spectrum of axiology, the modern world began to worship from other "gods": economic interest, profit, production and the accumulation of material wealth. The experience of past years has shown that Chase held after immediate economic profits lead to disastrous consequences, not only in humanitarian terms, but also economically, even on medium and long term. On the other hand, it was seen that, in the absence of ethical milestones science can produce miracles both beneficial for mankind and disaster with incalculable track. Here's what makes its place in today's world the notion that human development must

be based on a clear ethical responsibility assumed by policymakers in the economic, political, legal or scientific.

Valentin-Bădescu

ETHICAL AND MORAL BEHAVIOR, THE DETERMINING FACTOR OF SOCIAL AND SPIRITUAL REVIVAL IN ROMANIA

Responsibility means the solidarity of the individual with those acts or of others, whose consequences would seem desirable for oneself and for the Organization of, and carrying out times to decide which adheres freely. Seen in relation to the freedom, responsibility can be defined as a correlation between individual freedom and collective; when the individual, acting freely, not only affects, but also stimulates the shape and reinforce the freedom of other individuals of the group or the community.

Key words: freedom, accountability, responsibility, fairness, ethics, morality, the rule of law, sanction

Валентин Бадешку

НРАВСТВЕННОЕ ПОВЕДЕНИЕ КАК ОПРЕДЕЛЯЮЩИЙ ФАКТОР СОЦИАЛЬНОГО И ДУХОВНОГО ВОЗРОЖДЕНИЯ В РУМЫНИИ

Ответственность означает солидарность индивида с другими людьми и их действиями, чьи последствия являются желательными для себя и для Организации. Рассматривая свободу, ответственность как взаимосвязь между принципами свободы личности и коллектива; когда человек, действуя свободно, не только поражает, но и стимулирует формы и укрепления свободы других лиц, группы или сообщества.

Ключевые слова: свобода, ответственность, справедливость, этика, нравственности, законность, санкция.

Валентин Бадешку

МОРАЛЬНЕ ПОВЕДІНКА ЯК ВИЗНАЧАЛЬНИЙ ФАКТОР СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ТА ДУХОВНОГО ВІДРОДЖЕННЯ В РУМУНІЇ

Відповідальність означає солідарність індивіда з іншими людьми та їхніми діями, чії наслідки є бажаними для себе і для Організації. Розглядаючи свободу, відповідальність як взаємозв'язок між принципами свободи особистості і колективу; коли людина, діючи вільно, не тільки породжує, але і стимулює форми і зміцнення свободи інших осіб, групи або спільноти.

Ключові слова: свобода, відповідальність, справедливість, етика, моральність, законність, санкція.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 14.10.2013

UDK 37

*Nicola Roxana-Gabriela,
Petroșani, Romania*

„ASTRA” AND THE CHOIR FROM ORĂȘTIE

The requests made within the programme belonging to *The Association for the Romanian Language and the Romanian people culture*, set up at Sibiu in 1861, have been those of promotion and exploitation of national traditions, the way they have been kept since immemorial times. All the social categories have exemplarily answered this imperative. „Astra” has imposed something unique, has succeeded into an innovation within the Romanians from the places of the Hunedoara county, that have realised due to the proportion between the specific domains and solutions to perpetuate a programme, some ideas and some traditional means, coming from all the social categories.

Notable merits had „Astra” also in the action of artistic activity stimulation, especially by setting up and supporting choirs, brass bands, folk dance bands, by organizing social soirées and literary-artistic soirées, both in towns and in villages. There have also been initiated prizes contests, a special attention being paid to the training of some artistic bands leaders, recruited among the villages intellectuals, thus contributing to the enrichment of the spiritual life of the rural villages and to the promotion of the authentic values.

In 1913 the „Astra” general reunion was held. That was why the inhabitants of Orăștie did their best for this holiday not to miss out the traditional contest of the choir with a great programme. The choir had a rich and select repertoire, singing from the creations of G. Dima, Timotei Popovici, Augustin Bena, D. Chiriac, C. Porumbescu¹⁵. If a few months ago the „Astra” reunion had as a conductor the young Ionel Rădulescu, in September 1913 the choir was conducted by Aurel Medrea graduate of the absolvent al Viena¹⁶ Conservatoire. The programme was well chosen and to ensure the success, singers from other towns, such as Veturia Tritean from Sibiu and Cella Delavrancea¹⁷ have been invited.

¹⁵ Ion Iliescu, Tiberiu Istrate, *Orăștie 750 ani*, Deva, 1974, p. 156.

¹⁶ Maria Vîrtopeanu, *Din activitatea Reuniunii de cântări din Orăștie*, în *Sargetia*, 1982-1983, nr. XVI-XVII, p.622.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.